

Appl. No. 09/975,246  
Amdt. dated 10/26/2005  
Reply to Office action of 06/29/2005

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 06/29/2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 16-20 and allowed claims 1-20.

#### ***Claim Amendments***

Applicant has amended claims 11-15 to more clearly define the invention and to clarify the antecedent basis for "the processor."

#### ***Claim Objections***

1. The Examiner objects to claims 16-20 because it is not clear that the apparatus is a switching node. The Examiner objects to claim 19 because it lacks a period. Applicant has made appropriate corrections.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-20.

Appl. No. 09/975,246  
Amdt. dated 10/26/2005  
Reply to Office action of 06/29/2005

***Conclusion***


Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10/26/2005

By

  
James Henry  
Reg. No. 41,064  
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)